

REMARKS

The Examiner sets forth on page 2 of the Office Action that the present invention contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention, and these species lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single generic inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. The Examiner deems species 1 corresponds to Figures 1-2 and claims 1-2; and species 2 corresponds to Figures 3-5 and claims 3-9.


Applicant asserts that a single search of pertinent prior art would appear to suffice for all aspects of the invention. Therefore, Applicant urges the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement.

Applicant deems this Response to be fully responsive to the Office Action, and reiterates the election of species 1 corresponding to claims 1-2 and Figures 1-2. If further issues regarding the restriction persist, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please charge any necessary fees associated with this communication to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080. A duplicate of this sheet is enclosed. Applicant requests any extension of time necessary to respond.

Respectfully submitted,

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

By 
Anthony A. Laurentano
Registration No. 38,220
Attorney for Applicant

28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 227-7400

Date: **December 2, 2002**